

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 18 2006**

Application No. 10/658,151

Reply to Office Action

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful consideration given the present patent application and for the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action dated April 18, 2006, and the references applied therein. In response, applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 27-30, 38, 43, 49, and 51; canceled, without prejudice, claims 6, 8, 9, 20, 33-37, 48, 50, and 52-55; and added new claim 66 to further define the invention. Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration in light of the following remarks is requested.

With respect to the claim suggestions presented in the Office Action, applicants have followed the suggestions with respect to claims 3 and 27. Claim 34 has been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering the suggestion moot.

With respect to the Section 112 rejections, claim 29 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for "the material." Claims 30 and 38 have been amended to harmonize the terminology regarding the conveyor. Reference to "a spreader disc" has been removed from claim 43. References to "the manifold" and "the lines" have been removed from claim 51.

Turning now to the substantive rejections, the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed. Doherty fails to teach or suggest a vehicle combination as recited in amended claim 1. For example, Doherty fails to teach or suggest a storage and dispensing apparatus having a liquid containment vessel with a connecting section disposed between the first and second side sections and between the bottom and the base.

With respect to amended claim 28, Doherty fails to teach or suggest the claimed vehicle combination. For example, Doherty fails to teach or suggest a vehicle having a liquid dispensing system having a plurality of movable nozzles and a control system that independently adjusts the nozzles in response to the condition of at least one parameter. Doherty provides a "spray bar 56."

With respect to amended claim 38, Doherty fails to teach or suggest the claimed vehicle combination. For example, Doherty fails to teach or suggest a liquid dispensing system with an anti-icing system including at least one nozzle rotatable along at least two perpendicular axes.

The Office Action objected to claim 20 as depending from a rejected base claim, but indicated it would be allowable if re-written in independent form including the content of

Application No. 10/658,151

Reply to Office Action

intervening claims. Claim 20 has been canceled with prejudice and new claim 66 has been added. Claim 66 has the features of claim 20 and the base claim and the substance of many of the intervening claims and is considered to be allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Fitbin, Reg. No. 51,677
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: October 18, 2006